

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
ASHEVILLE DIVISION
1:22-cv-00062-MR**

CHARLES JORDAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
CITY OF ASHEVILLE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's recent filings. [Docs. 14, 15].

For the sake of economy, the Court incorporates its previous Orders in this matter by reference. [See Docs. 10, 12]. The Court recently dismissed this action after Plaintiff's Amended Complaint failed to comply with the Court's initial review Order on Plaintiff's original Complaint and for generally failing to state a claim for relief. [Doc. 12; see Docs. 10, 11]. Five days after the Court dismissed this action, the Clerk received additional documents filed by Plaintiff, which included another "Amended Complaint" [Doc. 14] and a document labeled "Amended Civil Rights Complaint 1983" [Doc. 15], but which appears more like an Addendum to Docket No. 14 and was docketed as such. Regardless of their titles, these filings purport to assert separate,

unrelated causes of action against a different set of Defendants than Plaintiff named in his first Amended Complaint [Doc. 11].¹ The Court previously admonished Plaintiff that he may not bring multiple unrelated claims against unrelated defendants in the same action. [Doc. 10 at 5]. Nonetheless, rather than file a separate action to redress these separate claims, Plaintiff simply filed multiple amended complaints in the same action against different sets of Defendants. Plaintiff may not do this. The Court will, therefore, strike these filings from the record in this matter. If Plaintiff wishes to proceed with these claims, he must file a new, distinct action with this Court and either pay the filing fee for such action or obtain in forma pauperis status.


ORDER

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and Addendum [Docs. 14, 15] are **STRICKEN** from the record in this matter.

The Clerk is respectfully instructed to terminate the remaining Defendants listed on the docket of this matter.

Signed: May 27, 2022

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Martin Reidinger
Chief United States District Judge



¹ It appears that Docket Nos. 11, 14, and 15 were mailed by Plaintiff on the same day in three separate envelopes. [See Docs. 11-1, 14-1, 15-1]. Docket Nos. 14 and 15, however, were not received by the Clerk until a week after Docket No. 11 due to mail delays.